

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present amendment is intended to place the application in condition for allowance and is believed to overcome all of the objections and rejections made by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15, 16, 25 and 26 to more properly claim the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 - 26 are presented for examination.

In Paragraphs 2 - 7 of the Office Action, claims 1 - 6 and 17 - 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Glogau, WO 98/25373 ("Glogau").

In Paragraphs 8 - 13 of the Office Action, claims 7 - 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glogau in view of Granger et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,959 ("Granger").

Distinctions between Claimed Invention and Publication WO 98/25373 to Glogau and U.S. Patent No. 6,480,959 to Granger et al.

In one embodiment, the present invention concerns copy protection of digital images stored on a server computer and available for viewing over the Internet. A remote administration tool provides an explorer-type interface for an administrator to set protection status of digital image files. Specifically, as disclosed in the present specification and as illustrated in the user interface of FIG. 13, protection manager 128 (FIG. 1) in remote computer 130 controls protection status of digital image files 108 and 110 resident on server computer 100. Steps 412 - 434 (FIG. 4) disclose computer 130 receiving a site map of folders and files from the file system of computer 100, selecting by a user of computer 130 at least one folder or file, and editing the at least one folder or file's protection status. After setting protection status for selected files, computer 130 sends the protection statuses to server computer 100, which enforces the protection (original specification / page 15, line 18 - page 17, line 10; protection manager 128 of FIG. 1 and the discussion thereof at page 20, lines 7 - 14; FIG. 3 and the discussion thereof at page 22, line 25 - page 24, line 21; FIG. 4 and the discussion thereof at page 24, line 22 - page 27, line 2; user interface illustrated in FIG. 13 and the discussion thereof at page 41, line 16 - page 42, lines 22).

Glogau describes copy protection of a computer work, such as a web site, that includes individual components contained within the work, such as

objects referenced within HTML pages within the web site. The individual components can be selectively protected, as dictated by an owner of the computer work, such as the web site owner. End users subsequently requesting access to the computer work, are required to execute appropriate license agreements to access protected components, or alternatively are restricted to accessing only unprotected components.

As illustrated at step 4 of FIG. 6 and at step 16 of FIG. 7, and described respectively on page 22, lines 6 and 7 and on page 23, line 19 – page 24, line 6, Glogau operates by (i) incorporating a protected web site into a copy protection server; and (ii) modifying HTML files within the web site by inserting special protection tags therewithin, based on instructions received from an owner of the web site. Specifically, on page 17, lines 14 – 19, Glogau describes “... *incorporating the web site into the copy protection system ...*” and “... *a web site for which protection is desired is configured in a certain manner ...*”. More specifically, on page 18, lines 19 – 24, Glogau indicates “*The site examination server software typically sets a protection flag (i.e., a ‘Protection Tag’ element of an HTML object data structure described below) in order to indicate web site components that are to be protected and the level of protection desired, while setting an ignore flag (i.e., “Ignore Flag” element of an HTML object data structure described below) to bypass web site components that are to be ignored.*” Moreover, each of the independent claims of Glogau includes “*retrieving the work in computer readable form*”.

Moreover, as indicated in FIG. 9 of Glogau, when the computer hosting the site examination software is remote from the computer hosting the protected web site, as is the case with the present invention, the protection process of Glogau operates at the remote computer, and not at the computer hosting the protected web site.

Granger describes combating software piracy by encrypting user data. Granger was cited by the Examiner in rejecting the limitations of claims 7, 11, 15 and 16 that involve encryption, as set forth in Paragraph 10 of the Office Action.

In distinction to Glogau, the present invention does not retrieve HTML files by a remote server computer nor does it protect them at the remote location, although such techniques can be employed in addition to the present invention in certain embodiments. Rather, as described hereinabove, the present invention teaches a very different paradigm for protecting web sites at their native locations, by retrieving site maps, setting protection statuses, and transmitting the protection statuses to the native computers hosting the web sites. Yet another

distinction between the present invention and Glogau is that Glogau describes forbidding access to protected objects by server-side protection software (Glogau / step 27 of FIG. 9 and step 38 of FIG. 10), whereas the present invention teaches copy protecting protected files by client-side protection software (present specification / page 14, lines 10 - page 15, line 17).

Accordingly, applicant has amended the independent claims to further clarify and single out these various distinctions.

The rejections of claims 1 - 26 in paragraphs 2 - 13 of the Office Action will now be dealt with specifically.

As to amended independent method claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claims 1 of

“retrieving, at an administrative computer, a site map of folders and files within a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”,

“sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”, and

“copy-protecting the at least one file by copy-protection software running on the client computer, if the at least one file is designated by the protection status information as being protected”

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau.

Applicant notes that in Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites Glogau, page 19, line 22 – page 20, line 22, as teaching “*copy-protection software running on the client computer*”. However, applicant respectfully submits that such software does not appear to be described at the location cited, since Glogau’s site examination software is server software (Glogau / page 19, line 22 , and page 20, lines 20 and 21). Glogau does describe a cookie file on the end-user computer system, but the cookie file is simply an ASCII text file including a user name and a code (Glogau / page 20, lines 17 – 19).

Because claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 21 and 22 depend from claim 1 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 21 and 22 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Glogau.

Accordingly claims 1 – 3, 17, 18, 21 and 22 are deemed to be allowable.

As to amended independent system claim 4, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 4 of

“a user interface within an administrative computer, for displaying a site map of folders and files in a server computer file system, the

administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”,

“a transmitter within the administrative computer, for sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”, and

“a copy-protection module residing on a client computer, for copy-protecting at least one file downloaded from the server computer to the client computer if the at least one file is designated by the protection status information as being protected”,

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau.

Because claims 5, 6, 19, 20, 23 and 24 depend from claim 4 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 6, 19, 20, 23 and 24 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Glogau.

Accordingly claims 4 – 6, 19, 20, 23 and 24 are deemed to be allowable.

Regarding amended independent claim 7, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 7 of

“retrieving, at an administrative computer, a site map of folders and files within a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”, and

“sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau and Granger.

Because claims 8 - 10 depend from claim 7 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 - 10 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Glogau, Granger or a combination of Glogau and Granger.

Accordingly claims 7 - 10 are deemed to be allowable.

Regarding amended independent claim 11, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 11 of

“a user interface within an administrative computer, for displaying a site map of folders and files in a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”, and

“a transmitter within the administrative computer, for sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau and Granger.

Because claims 12 - 14 depend from claim 11 and include additional features, applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 - 14 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Glogau, Granger or a combination of Glogau and Granger.

Accordingly claims 11 - 14 are deemed to be allowable.

Regarding amended independent claim 15, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 15 of

“retrieving, at an administrative computer, a site map of folders and files within a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”, and

“sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau and Granger.

Accordingly claim 15 is deemed to be allowable.

Regarding amended independent claim 16, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 16 of

“a user interface within an administrative computer, for displaying a site map of folders and files in a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”, and

“a transmitter within the administrative computer, for sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau and Granger.

Accordingly claim 16 is deemed to be allowable.

Regarding amended independent claim 25, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 25 of

“retrieving, at an administrative computer, a site map of folders and files within a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”,

“sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”, and

“sending substitute data from the server computer to the client computer in response to the request”

are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has rejected claims 25 and 26 in Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, but it appears that the Examiner has not

addressed the limitation of *“sending substitute data from the server computer to the client computer in response to the request”*.

Accordingly claim 25 is deemed to be allowable.

Regarding amended independent claim 26, applicant respectfully submits that the limitations in claim 26 of

“a user interface within an administrative computer, for displaying a site map of folders and files in a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”,

“a transmitter within the administrative computer, sending the protection status information from the administrative computer to the server computer”, and

“a file copy protector on the server computer controlling the server computer to send substitute data to a client computer, in response to receiving a request from the client computer for data within a file that is designated by the protection status information as being protected”,
are neither shown nor suggested in Glogau.

Accordingly claim 26 is deemed to be allowable.

Support for New and Amended Claims in Original Specification

Regarding independent method claims 1, 7, 15 and 25, the limitation of *“retrieving, at an administrative computer, a site map of folders and files within a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”* is described in the original specification at steps 412 and 414 of the flowchart of FIG. 4. and at the corresponding discussion on page 25, lines 10 – 15.

Regarding independent system claims 4, 11, 16 and 26, the limitation of *“a user interface within an administrative computer, displaying a site map of folders and files in a server computer file system, the administrative computer being remote from the server computer and communicatively coupled therewith”* is described in the original specification at elements 302, 306 and 308 of system diagram FIG. 3 and at the corresponding discussion on page 23, lines 2 – 4.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/4/05

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By Marc Sockol
Marc Sockol
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,823

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

Date: 5/4/05

By: Ines Francetic
Ines Francetic